



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

300.5  
T44

RICHARD H. TIERNEY, S.J.

CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGY



THE LIBRARY







# Catholic Sociology

Newman's Alleged "Scurrility"  
Catholics and "Billy" Sunday

## The Catholic Mind

SEMI-MONTHLY

Price 5 cents; \$1.00 per year

Entered as second-class matter, October 22, 1914, at the Post Office at  
New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

*Vol. XIII, No. 7. April 8, 1915*

THE AMERICA PRESS

59 East 83d Street

NEW YORK

UNIVERSITY OF  
MINNESOTA

LIBRARY

Digitized by Google

# THE CATHOLIC MIND

THE FOLLOWING NUMBERS ARE STILL OBTAINABLE:

## 1908

10. *Plain Words on Socialism.* C. S. Devas, M.A.
13. *Mr. Birrell's University Bill.*
16. *The Roman Court.*
19. *Genius of Cardinal Wiseman* Wilfrid Ward

## 1909

1. *Lord Kelvin and the Existence of God.* H. V. Gill, S.J.
2. *Primary Education in France.*

## 1910

3. *The Sons of St. Francis.* Herbert Thurston, S.J.
- 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. *Catholic Missions.* I, II, III, IV, V. Hilarion Gil
- 11, 12, 13. *Calistus III and Halley's Comet.* I, II, III.
- 14, 15. *St. Charles Borromeo Encyclical.*
18. *The XXI Eucharistic Congress.* Edward Spillane, S.J.
19. *The Holy Eucharist in Early Canada.* T. J. Campbell, S.J.
- 20, 21. *Pius X on Recent Manifestations of Modernism.*

## 1911

- 11, 12. *Cardinal Gibbons' Jubilee.*
14. *Protests of Pius X and Bishops of Portugal.*
16. *The Catholic Press.* E. Spillane, S.J.
17. *English Economics and Catholic Ethics.* Michael Maher, S.J.
18. *Catholicism at Home and Abroad.*
19. *The Early Church and Communism.* John Rickaby, S.J.
- 20, 21. *Scotland in Penal Days.* His Eminence Francis Aidan Cardinal Gasquet.
22. *Children's Early and Frequent Communion.* Joseph Husslein, S.J.
- 23, 24. *The Sacred College of Cardinals.* Henry J. Swift, S.J.

## 1912

4. *Doctor Lingard.* John Gerard, S.J.
- 6, 7. *Horrors of Portuguese Prisons.*
9. *Lord Halifax and Anglican Orders.* His Eminence Francis Aidan Cardinal Gasquet.
- 11, 12. *Marist Missions in the Pacific. II, III.* Rt. Rev. John J. Grimes, S.M., Bishop of Christ Church
13. *The Religious Teacher.* M. J. O'Connor, S.J.
14. *Portuguese Missions of Angola.* Rev. C. J. Rooney, C.S.Sp.
17. *The People's Pope.* M. Kenny, S.J.
24. *Father Algué's Barocyclonometer.* New York Tribune, Dec., 1912

## 1913

5. *Capital Punishment.* Rev. John J. Ford, S.J.
7. *The Anglican Benedictines of Caldey.* Dom Bede Camm, O.S.B.
10. *Revising the Vulgate.* Dom Adrian Weld Blundell, O.S.B.
16. *Catholicism and Americanism.* Most Rev. John Ireland, D.D.

## 1914

- 2, 3. *The Church and the Money Lender.* Henry Irwin, S.J.
5. *Liberty of Conscience.* Rt. Rev. John E. Gunn, D.D.
14. *Tercentenary of St. Teresa.*
15. *Freemasonry and Catholicism in America.* M. Kenny, S.J.
19. *Justice to Mexico*
21. *The Needy Family and Institutions.* R. H. Tierney S.J.
22. *The Architect's Plan.* John A. Cotter, S.J.
23. *Mexican Liberalism.* A. de F.
24. *First Encyclical of Benedict XV.*

## 1915

1. *The Catholic Press.* E. Hull, S.J.
2. *The "Menace" and the Mails.* Paul Bakewell
3. *The Ethics of War.* Edward Masterson, S.J.
4. *Sixty Historical "Don'ts."* James J. Walsh, M.D., Ph.D.
5. *The Jesuit Myth.* Robert Swickerath, S.J.
6. *Fifty "Don'ts" of Science.* James J. Walsh, M.D., Ph.D.
- Catholics in the Y. M. C. A.* Nelson Hume

Single numbers 5c. each, \$3 per hundred.

THE AMERICA PRESS, 59 EAST 83D STREET, NEW YORK.

## Catholic Sociology

By RICHARD H. TIERNEY, S.J.

*An Address Delivered at the Annual Meeting of the St. Vincent de Paul Society of the Baltimore Archdiocese, February 25, 1915.*

*Your Eminence, Reverend Fathers, Ladies and Gentlemen:—*

You have asked me to talk about Catholic ideals in sociology. The subject is a large one, for it has at least a four-fold aspect. It has first of all, a historical aspect; secondly, a theological aspect; thirdly, a strictly moral aspect; and fourthly, an economic aspect.

The historical aspect takes us back through the centuries, two thousand years, to the pitiful Figure on the naked Cross, dying that He might regenerate men. Our sociology, as everything Catholic, centers around Him, Who went to His death reviled by the creatures He created, buffeted by the very elements He called forth from nothing. Apparently He died a failure. The doctrine He preached seemed discredited. He went down to death a pauper, despised by the rabble, deserted by His followers. But He died that He might live and He came forth from the grave with a larger, fuller life, and when He went up to heaven He sent down upon the little society that He had formed and sanctified, the Holy Spirit, Who breathed into it the breath of a new life, and hallowed it again in a peculiar way. That society, the Church, embodied not only all of Christ's doctrines, but all of Christ's ideals; that is, that society, the Church, not only held uncorrupt and incorruptible the Master's doctrine, but it held the motive force that



could make that doctrine a practical thing in the lives of Catholics. In no way has the Church put Christ's doctrine into practice more effectually, with more holy zeal, than in work for the poor and sick, the suffering members of Christ.

Not so long after our Lord's Ascension the Church made its center at Rome and was a poor, struggling little thing, with a few old fishermen and some slaves as its sole members. Its lot was cast in a world seething with sin. The great tyrants of the Empire cast their eyes upon it; they thought it a danger to the State, so they drove it into the ground; and there it dragged out a precarious existence.

And when the Apostles and other simple followers at last came forth from the bowels of the earth, what did they see? and to what did they come? Did they come to a world showing signs of regeneration through the Blood of Christ? No. They came back into a world filled with the deeds of Satan. Rome in those days was reeking with vice. It was composed of poor, unfortunate slaves, miserable physically, but a thousand times more miserable spiritually; men of wealth who were indescribably lustful and high-born dames who actually measured their years by the number of husbands they had had, and whose names were a hissing and a by-word. In that great city, moreover, there was not a single real hospital for the sick and maimed; not a single asylum for the poor, or for the dear little children that were dying by scores. Pity and mercy were unknown there, because the breath of Christ had not yet breathed over the city. Catholic sociology was unknown.

But before many years have passed what do we find? A marvelous change! For the villas of the wealthy are

converted into hospitals for the sick and into asylums for children. The spirit of Christ, the spirit of Catholic sociology was beginning to sweeten and purify the corrupt atmosphere of Rome. The mantle of Christ, Who was the greatest of all sociologists; the mantle of Christ, Who loved the poor and sick and desolate, had fallen upon worthy shoulders. There were many men in those days like the great St. Lawrence, who, when ordered to bring the Church's treasures to the tyrant, brought him the old, the crippled, the maimed and the diseased, thus showing the world how Catholic sociology works out in practice.

Time went on, and the spirit of Christ's love for the poor and ignorant kept spreading. Through all the centuries the Church's missionaries searched the forests and the jungle and gathered together savage peoples and taught them the Christian doctrine and the arts and the sciences. That was Catholic sociology.

The illustrious Order of St. Benedict was the greatest corporate instrument of sociology that the world has seen. One-third of the French towns owe their existence to these monks. Their methods have never been equaled, and they have been imitated only indifferently. The religious built their monasteries in the trackless forests and gathering together wild tribes from all sides, they turned their houses of prayer into schools and hospitals, where Christianity was taught, where the arts were cultivated, where distress was relieved. Soon wild souls became tame, uncouth intellects cultured, clumsy hands skilful. This is the Catholic idea of sociology.

Catholic sociology, moreover, is alive and vigorous to-day. For sociology is founded on Christ's doctrine; it is in fact nothing more nor less than the spiritual and corporal works of mercy, and Christ, mark it well, came

to regenerate souls unto the end of time. As a consequence His doctrine will live on to be your consolation and the consolation of your children, and the consolation of your children's children, even to the last.

This great work of Catholic sociology continues to-day. Not long since, when there was trouble in far-off South America, the cry went up that rubber merchants down there were torturing the Indians. Who was sent there to alleviate the suffering? The Catholic missionary, the truest sociologist. Moreover, if you look through the world, what do you see everywhere? Examples of the Church's sociological work, go where you will. Go forth into the splendid city of Baltimore, and on one hill you will see a cross, beneath which live hundreds of little children, picked up in the street, who are being brought up for Christ and the State. Such is Catholic sociology. Turn more to the left and you will see the noble buildings of a great hospital and in it lie moaning men and women, and by their sides sit the gentle nuns assuaging their pain, teaching them to bear suffering patiently for Christ's sake. That is Catholic sociology. Further on you will see a large industrial school for boys, who were bereft of parents at an early age. There, too, in the different shops are skilled brothers teaching their charges useful trades, bringing the boys up not only for God, but for a useful life as citizens—Catholic sociology again. And so the work goes on throughout the world, because Catholic sociology and the Catholic religion are inseparable. For Catholic sociology is as I have said the spiritual and corporal works of mercy, part and parcel of our religion.

Imagine, if you can, a sociology without the corporal and spiritual works of mercy. Imagine a sociology without the instruction of the ignorant: imagine a socio-

logy without the giving of food to the hungry, and of drink to the thirsty. Imagine it, if you can. These spiritual and corporal works of mercy are integral parts of Christ's eternal Gospel. He taught and practised them Himself. "And Jesus went about through all the towns and villages teaching in the synagogues and preaching the gospel of the kingdom and healing all diseases and infirmities." And when the great Precursor lay in his prison cell and sent messengers to Christ, asking if He were the Messiah, what word did Christ send back? Did He expound lofty doctrines? No; He simply said: Go back and tell him that the blind see, the deaf hear, go back and tell him that the halt are no longer infirm, go back and tell him that the poor have the Gospel preached unto them. Go back and tell him that I am spending Myself for the poor. That I am relieving all their wants. There, then, is our ideal. Our sociology is bound up with our religion; it is inseparable from it, and Christ is the Master of our religion, our Master, the Master of our sociology.

Christ is our ideal, but where is our charter? Our charter is clearly drawn up in the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew, beginning with the thirty-fourth and ending with the fortieth verse. You all remember it well, how the souls of the saved appear for judgment before the King Who smiles and says: "Come ye blessed of my father, possess you the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was hungry and you gave me to eat: I was thirsty and you gave me to drink: I was a stranger and you took me in." The blessed soul then asks: "Lord, when did we see thee hungry and fed thee: thirsty and gave thee drink? And when did we see thee a stranger and took thee in." And the King answers: "I say to

you, as long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me." There is our charter. There is our whole sociology; works of mercy done in the name of Christ, our Redeemer, and for Christ our Redeemer.

Just at this point a sharp line of demarcation between secular philanthropy and Catholic sociology is to be noted. Catholic sociology begins in God and flows down to the people. Philanthropy begins with man and ends with man. The mainspring of Catholic sociology is love of God; the mainspring of pure philanthropy is love of man. Catholic sociology is founded on a theology that makes God everything, and does everything for God primarily. Philanthropy is founded on a philosophy that prescind from God. In this regard it is well to remember that the fact that we do things for the love of God, does not make those things less effectual, does not make them less congenial to those who are helped. It but elevates the man who is helped, and teaches him that we recognize in him, the creature, a brother in Jesus Christ, the Man-God, that we do not lower ourselves or him in offering this help, but that we lift him and ourselves up to Christ. Ladies and Gentlemen, the only sociology that will last and do good to man is this kind of sociology. To teach the poor to appreciate the goods of the world, and to acquire exterior refinement without imparting to them a knowledge of Christ is to train a race of pagans: "Glittering scars with festering ills within."

To aid people, to pension them without teaching them the things that belong to their state, is to bring up a race of parasites, the more dangerous because of their ignorance of God. I insist on this. I wish to drive home the idea that Christ must never be lost sight of in our work

for the poor and needy. He is the ultimate object of all our labors. You have doubtless seen beautiful pictures representing St. Vincent de Paul walking through the slums of Paris, carrying under his cloak poor little abandoned infants. Do you think that St. Vincent de Paul loved those children less because he loved God more? Do you think the aid given those children was the less effective because St. Vincent de Paul saw in them immortal souls which he would save for Christ's sake?

Not long ago, I received a letter from Father Conrady, in his far-off leper colony. As he spoke of his work there, every now and then occurred this expression: "I am doing it for Christ." And what was he doing for Christ? He was living among the lepers, living a leper's life, to bring the lepers to Christ. All his work for them had this in view. Such was his sociology. It was Catholic sociology.

But how does this theory, it may be asked, work out in practice? Let us first consider the case of children and then that of adults. Now, it is a fundamental doctrine of Catholic ethics that the home is the unit of society, in the sense that the State has formally to do with the family. Moreover, it is a fundamental Catholic doctrine that the home is the natural place of the child. God has put into the heart of every man and every woman a natural inclination to enter into matrimony, and found a home into which children are born for God and the State. Before the coming of Christ matrimony was a natural contract, not a mere civil contract, and when Christ came, he sanctified it, elevated it to the plane of a sacrament, made it an instrument of many graces that man and woman might live together in mutual love and beget and educate children. The child then finds its natural place in the home. It is in the home that the little

one learns all that is high in hope and noble in aspiration : it is from the home that the child goes forth into the world fashioned to the image of the most perfect of men, Christ Our Lord.

There is no place in the great wide world, no institution however perfect, no institution however wealthy, no institution however carefully managed, that can replace the home. Be an institution as perfect as possible, yet, the mother is not there, the father is not there, the brother and sister are not there. When the mother is absent, there lies dormant in the heart of the child a great emotion intended by nature to play on the soul and lead it on to higher endeavor. When the father is absent, there lie dormant in the soul of the child elements that nothing else can call into action; and where the love of brother and sister is not, there also a soul is lacking in something.

Hence, it has always been the desire of the Church to preserve the home at all hazards. But, alas! at times, that is impossible. Impurity or drink, or some other unfortunate circumstance beyond the control of parents or child, forces children into an institution. What is the Catholic ideal of an institution? Simply this: the institution should be as home-like as possible, should be as uninstitutional as possible, should have as many of the qualities or characteristics of the home, as brain and good-will can give it. Hence, there should be in that institution a religious atmosphere; there should be discipline; there should be preparation for a useful life.

Now, discipline, ladies and gentlemen, does not consist in the measured tread of little feet. It is not oppression or suppression; it is not a force from without but a spontaneous growth of the soul under the guidance of religion.

Discipline is something interior. There is a double element in it; there is the intellectual element, and there is the volitional element. The child must first understand the difference between right and wrong. It must, above all, be taught to love the right and to scorn the wrong; and once having learned to know and love the right its will must be strengthened to such an extent that it would die rather than give up the right. But this will never be accomplished unless those in charge of our children teach them their religion and induce them to look up to Our Father in heaven with confidence. This presupposes a religious atmosphere which is produced not only by formal instruction but also by the holy lives of those whom God has set over our unfortunate boys and girls. This reminds me to urge you to resist by all legitimate means the awful practice of those who rob the needy child of its faith, a crime infamous beyond the telling. It is a sin crying to Heaven for vengeance to take advantage of the hunger and nakedness of a waif to make it an apostate.

There is yet another element to which I would call your attention. It is this: the child should be prepared to be a useful citizen. No institution which fails in this is worthy of the name. An institution which does not turn out useful citizens is a lie, and the sooner it ceases to exist, the better. It is doing children an injustice. Therefore, every institution should be most careful of the children's training. There should be play—and this is apt to be neglected at times, not so much now as in former days. Yet, play is an instinct of nature, a primal instinct which fairly drives the normal child to romp, that its muscles and sinews may be made strong for future stress. If we act against that instinct we do the child a great physical and psychological harm. But more



important still, every child who is put into an institution should be taught some useful trade. There is hardly any excuse these days for bringing a child up without a trade. Here in this great archdiocese there is that excellent institution, St. Mary's Industrial School, which has been a model for so many of its kind, and I am happy to say that in the State of New York the first institution to introduce vocational training for boys was the Christian Brothers' institution at Westchester. Throughout the country, too, there is now growing up in all the dioceses, institutions where the children are most carefully prepared for future work. The boys are being taught farming and carpentry; the girls are being taught dress-making and millinery. This is quite as it should be. Therefore, when all has been said, our idea of an institution is this: it is a place where the child can get as far as is possible, all that it got at home. We may fall short of our ideals; but, to fall short of our ideals is not the great fault. The great fault is to have no ideals. We fall short because we have not the means of carrying out all that we should and would carry out of our ideals. Nevertheless, the ideal is there before all Catholic workers. They are striving to live up to it; and their success is astounding the world.

Having spoken of the children, I should like to say a few words to you about some of the problems facing us in the larger cities. Mr. Biggs touched upon them very nicely, and I noticed he mentioned the Ozanam Society. I have had some experience with that Society in New York. It is doing a marvelous work. In New York City the Ozanam Society now has six club houses. The need of them is most apparent to one who goes among boys. Nearly all the boys have the faith, and what is a most peculiar thing, they have the faith firm and

strong, yet they are almost totally ignorant of Christian doctrine. Many of them, poor boys, do not know how to make their confession; many of them do not know the Our Father, and yet, through the grace of God, and the Sacrament of Baptism, the virtue of faith is there, waiting to be stirred into action.

There is now in many of our cities a great effort on the part of non-Catholic societies to get hold of those boys. Let me give you some figures without mentioning the city. Not long since I became very much interested in a certain institution which is entirely non-Catholic in influence, and to my utter amazement I found that sixteen hundred Catholic children were receiving instruction in non-Catholic doctrine. Later I looked in on a Protestant settlement and I found that fifty per cent. of the boys in attendance were Catholic boys, who are being quietly led away from the Church. I do not say that there was malice in those engaged in this work, but I do say that it is a most deplorable thing that our boys and girls are led astray in this way. If they are to be saved lay people are the ones to save them. You have noticed, as I have noticed, that there is a wave of radicalism sweeping over the country. This radicalism has alienated many people from the priests. As a consequence, many children seldom or never come in contact with the priest, and the priest is quite unable to go after them. It is, therefore, the solemn duty of those who enroll themselves in these societies to seek out those lost lambs and lead them to Christ.

The juvenile courts, too, need our attention. Many of the children who find their way there are Catholics, needy Catholics. The judges are sympathetic but the workers are few. This kind of charitable work is very important, because there is a great amount of good work

to be done in taking care of those children. In many cities guilds have been established to care for such children. In Chicago, for instance, there is a Catholic Ladies' Guild with one thousand members.

As for the grown people, what shall we do for them? Mr. Biggs has told you. Help them materially by all means, but don't forget their souls. We are apt to dole out bread or to give clothes and send the poor away without a word about Christ's charity. The aim of charity is to "reconstruct" that soul. That was St. Vincent de Paul's idea and Ozanam's too. Would that more of our Catholic men were interested in this work! Our college men are especially lacking in zeal for His cause. In one city only thirteen per cent. of the Catholic men who are working in the St. Vincent de Paul Society had a high school education. The brunt of the work is borne by poor, hard-working clerks who never had a chance for higher education. There is something wrong here. I wish that some strong men would arise in this country, denounce the college men, the Catholic college men, for their neglect of social work. They are shirking their responsibility shamefully. What is wrong? I leave the answer to you.

To-day you and I know that there is a great stress and strain upon the body politic. There is little respect for authority. Morals are bad; lawlessness is rife; selfishness has come to such a pitch that few men are willing to make sacrifices for others. Worst of all, many good men have become pessimistic. They have thrown down the battle-axe in despair. It is now your duty and mine to enhearten them by our sacrifices for God and God's poor, teaching them that God's arm is not shortened, and that as He, in the past, saved States through the efforts of good men, He will save them now by the same means.

It is our work, therefore, to go forth, ministering to the poor, the ignorant and the lowly, bringing unto their lives, Christ, the Saviour of mankind. Every Catholic social worker, to be a true worker, must be a Christopher, a Christ-bearer, a man or a woman who carries Christ to the souls of the poor. May this great society, which is flourishing so well here in Baltimore, spread throughout the United States, spreading with it Catholic sociology, the great hope of our Catholic people.

## NEWMAN'S ALLEGED "SCURRILITY"

By PAUL BAKEWELL

In the issue of *America* for March 22, appeared a letter from Mr. John Wiltbye in which he very effectively answers what would appear to be a gratuitous and which certainly is a very inaccurate statement from the *Outlook* of March 10. The quotation, as given in Mr. Wiltbye's letter, is as follows:

Cardinal Newman was brought up in England for defaming Father Achilli, who had left the Roman Catholic Church for the Protestant communion as Cardinal Newman had left the Protestant Church for the Roman Catholic communion. He was convicted of a libel and was mulcted to the extent of 12,000 English pounds, or \$60,000.

It is sometimes interesting, and in this case, I trust, may prove of value in the interest of truth, to trace the history of half-truths, such as those contained in the above quotation from the *Outlook*, to their origin. In this case I believe the source of the above-quoted statement is at hand; it is to be found in the remarks of G. F.

Williams, D.D., of Washington, D.C., made on February 1, 1915, at a hearing before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, in the House of Representatives, Sixty-third Congress, third session, on H. R. 20,644 and H. R. 21,183, Bills to Exclude Certain Publications from the Mail. The Bills appear in the *Congressional Record*. On pages twenty-five and twenty-six of that public record certain of Dr. Williams' remarks are given as follows:

My objection to this law, gentlemen of the committee, as an American citizen, is that it is entirely unnecessary. As Dr. McKim has shown, the courts are quite sufficient to protect any one in case of libel, defamation, or scurrility. Cardinal Newman was once a clergyman of the Church of England, and after he left the Church of England Father Achilli, of the Roman Church, left the Roman Catholic Church and became a Protestant clergyman. Cardinal Newman was brought up for trial for defaming ex-Father Achilli. Judge Coleridge presided in the case. I have never in my life read such *scurrility* as Cardinal Newman dealt out to that poor man who had chosen to be free of the Roman Catholic Church. Nothing was hidden in the record of that suit against him, which was tried, and when he was upon the stand Judge Coleridge asked him how it was possible for a man who once stood so high to use such language, and to use such *scurrility* against a man whom he had to face on the witness stand. It was the most *scurrilous* thing I have ever read, and the result was that Cardinal Newman lost the suit and was *mulcted* to the extent of 12,000 English pounds, or \$60,000. The charge that Judge Coleridge gave to Cardinal Newman at that time, I think, ought to be published in this country. I think it would help this cause. (The italics or emphasis in the above quotation are my own.)

With the words of the *Outlook* article and the above statements of Dr. Williams before us, it will be observed that both charge that in the Achilli case *Cardinal Newman* was "*mulcted* to the extent of 12,000 English pounds or \$60,000." "*Mulcted*," as every one conversant

with the sense of that word knows, means punished for an offence or misdemeanor by the imposition of a fine or forfeiture: a pecuniary fine; it does not mean, as Mr. Wiltbye points out, the expenses, attorneys' fees, etc., etc., to which a defendant in a case may be put. Yet the charge, in the two statements quoted above is, not that it cost Father Newman (he was not then a cardinal) \$60,000, in lawyers' fees, in bringing witnesses to England from Italy and other parts of Europe, and other expenses incident to defending that case, but the distinct statement in each instance is that he was "mulcted" (which means punished by a fine imposed on him by the Court) "to the extent of 12,000 English pounds, \$60,000."

Now, as a matter of fact, as a result of that trial, Father Newman was fined ("mulcted") to the extent of exactly one hundred English pounds, or \$500. Moreover, the great John Henry Newman was not a cardinal when that fine was imposed upon him in 1853; he was not made a cardinal until 1879, twenty-six years afterwards.

So much for the common inaccuracy of statement made by Dr. Williams before a Committee of Congress on February 1, 1915, and repeated in the *Outlook* on March 10, 1915. But the malice underlying each of these inaccurate statements must be evident to any one. It rests in this, that in each statement the attempt is made: (1) To create the impression that John Henry Newman had committed something so wicked that the fine (presumably commensurate with the offence) amounted to the enormous sum of \$60,000; and (2) that when that fine was imposed, it was imposed upon one who was then a cardinal of the Catholic Church. As I have shown, and as is readily ascertainable, neither of these statements or implications is true.

Moreover, Mr. Wiltbye clearly pointed out in his let-

ter to *America*, that the *London Times*, then was, as it now is, far from being a pro-Catholic paper, but then reflected, as it now reflects, English public opinion. In commenting on that trial which was held, remember, in the midst of the "No-Popery" agitation in England and shortly after the "No-Popery" riots in London, the *Times* declared, as every one knew, that the trial of that case against Father Newman for alleged libel against Achilli was a solemn farce and a disgrace to the administration of justice in England. As noted in Ward's biography of Newman, Vol. I, p. 292 :

In a leading article the *Times* spoke of the three days' proceedings as "indecorous in their nature, unsatisfactory in their result, and little calculated to increase the respect of the people for the administration of justice or the estimation by foreign nations of the English name and character." "We consider," the article added, "that a great blow has been given to the administration of justice in this country, and that Roman Catholics will henceforth have only too good reason for asserting that there is no justice for them in cases tending to arouse the Protestant feelings of judges and juries." These remarks represent the opinion of the educated public. Dr. Achilli was no longer in the public eye an innocent martyr whose testimony against Romanism was unimpeachable. Evidence which could not in a moment prevail with the jury against the wonderful anti-Catholic bigotry of the time gradually sank into the public mind and had its effect. Even apart from his past life in Italy, there were the strongest proofs that Achilli had continued since his arrival in England to disgrace himself. One after another the servant girls at the houses in which he had lodged quite recently gave evidence against him. The jury would not believe them. But the public did. Achilli's teeth were drawn; he ceased to be an effective champion of the Protestant religion, and he shortly disappeared from the public view.

For further authority and a history of that infamous case, Ward refers to "The Achilli Trial," by Finlayson. Besides, if any one is really concerned with getting at the

bottom facts, this whole matter must be looked at through the glasses of the first half of the nineteenth century, between, let us say, 1829 and 1853, in which last-named year that outrageous judgment against Newman in the Achilli case was rendered. In England, Parliaments, from the time of Elizabeth to the time of George III, had enacted outrageous laws against Catholics. It was not until 1829 that the Catholic Emancipation Act was passed in England, doing, even then, only partial justice to Catholics. Afterwards, in 1850, the Catholic Hierarchy, with Wiseman at its head, was re-established in England. Meanwhile, the Tractarian Movement, started at Oxford, with John Henry Newman as its acknowledged leader, had made its influence felt and resulted in many of the most brilliant men of Oxford coming over to the Catholic Church. Pusey, who followed part of the way, was never converted, and many so-called "Puseyites," of whom Justice Coleridge was one, were especially bitter against Newman, the leader of the Tractarian Movement, because Newman became a Catholic. This explains the so-called lecture or "*charge that Judge Coleridge gave to Cardinal Newman at that time*" (the time Coleridge rendered judgment against Newman in the Achilli case), to which Dr. Williams refers in his statement before the Congressional Committee above quoted. Of that charge, Wilfrid Ward, in his life of Cardinal Newman, Vol. I, p. 301, quoting, largely from Newman's letters at the time, records, among other things, the following facts:

I have been fined one hundred pounds, and imprisoned *till* the fine was paid—which of course meant no imprisonment at all. I have not heard opinions, but my friends present *think* it a triumph. I had a most horrible jobation from Coleridge, of



which the theme was "deterioration of converts." I had been everything good when I was a Protestant—but I had fallen since I was a Catholic. They would not let me speak. . . .

As to the judgment, it is quite true that Coleridge said about me all that was reported. He spoke very low, really (I think) from agitation—but I must ever think that he committed a great mistake and impertinence in what he said. He made me subserve his Puseyite theory, and held me up as a "spectacle" how men deteriorate when they become Catholics. His speech was full of mistakes and inconsistencies, if I chose to expose it. He simply misstated facts, as every one would grant, directly it was pointed out. But I really think he thought he was performing a duty; so, what can one say? I have reason to know that his brother judges were surprised, if not annoyed, by what he said. In one respect the *Times'* report was not correct. He gave up the jury, and said the judges would have granted a new trial, if by the Law they could have done so. *Every one* considers it a triumph. . . .

I could not help being amused at poor Coleridge's prose. I have no doubt it gave him pain, and I think he wished to impress me. I trust I behaved respectfully, but he must have seen that I was as perfectly unconcerned as if I had been in my own room. But so it was. Putting aside supernatural views and motives (of which, alas! I have not overmuch), mere habit, as in the case of the skinned eels, would keep me from being annoyed. I have not been the butt of slander and scorn for twenty years for nothing.

It is of that attack on Newman, by Coleridge, who was animated by a special bias and strong religious prejudice, that Dr. Williams, in his remarks before the Congressional Committee, on February 1, 1915, quoted above, says:

The charge that Judge Coleridge gave to Cardinal Newman [as I have already shown, John Henry Newman was not a cardinal then] at that time, I think, ought to be published in this country. I think it would help this cause.

Help what cause? Evidently the London *Times*, when

that "charge," as Dr. Williams calls it, was given, did not think it would help any cause, and that, so far as the cause of justice in England was then concerned, it was calculated to hurt it in the estimation of the educated public in England and Europe.

But one last word with respect to Dr. Williams' remarks before the Congressional Committee on February 1, 1915, quoted above. Among the inaccurate and reckless statements which Dr. Williams there makes, he says: "I have never in my life read such *scurrility* as Cardinal Newman dealt out to that poor man" [meaning the immoral wretch and notorious blackguard, Achilli]. . . . "It was the most *scurrilous* thing I have ever read."

In this quotation from Dr. Williams' statements, I have purposely italicized the adjective "*scurrilous*," because, my remarks, at least, are addressed to educated people. This being so I need not define the word "*scurrilous*."

Now, no educated person, who has read the writings of the great scholar, the finished gentleman, the master of the English language, doctor of divinity, and the priest of the Church, John Henry Newman, would believe that it was morally possible for John Henry Newman to write scurrilous matter, *i. e.*, that which is low, indecent, foul or vile. In revealing the true character of an immoral wretch, whom it became Newman's duty to attack, because the person in question had defamed, as others before and since have done, the Catholic Church, it might be necessary for John Henry Newman to refer to the bare fact that the blackguard had committed certain crimes, but all that could be done, as it was in fact done by Newman, without using vile, foul or indecent language. That Newman did not use scurrility in his charges

against Achilli is evidenced, Dr. Williams' statement to the contrary notwithstanding, by what Newman actually did say of Achilli and which was the basis of the libel suit to which Dr. Williams refers. Here is what Newman actually said, quoted in full from p. 279 of Vol. I of Wilfrid Ward's Newman:

Ah! Dr. Achilli, I might have spoken of him last week, had time admitted of it. The Protestant world flocks to hear him, because he has something to tell of the Catholic Church. He has something to tell, it is true; he *has* a scandal to reveal, he *has* an argument to exhibit. It is a simple one, and a powerful one, as far as it goes—and it is *one*. That one argument is himself; it is his presence which is the triumph of Protestants; it is the sight of him which is a Catholic's confusion. It is indeed our great confusion, that our Holy Mother could have had a priest like him. He feels the force of the argument, and he shows himself to the multitude that is gazing on him. "Mothers of families," he seems to say, "gentle maidens, innocent children, look at me, for I am worth looking at. You do not see such a sight every day. Can any Church live over the imputation of such a production as I am? I have been a Catholic and an infidel; I have been a Roman priest and a hypocrite; I have been a profligate under a cowl. I am that Father Achilli who, as early as 1826, was deprived of my faculty to lecture for an offence which my superiors did their best to conceal, and who, in 1827, had already earned the reputation of a scandalous friar. I am that Achilli who, in the diocese of Viterbo, in February, 1831, robbed of her honor a young woman of eighteen; who, in September, 1833, was found guilty of a second such crime, in the case of a person of twenty-eight; and who perpetrated a third in July, 1834, in the case of another, aged twenty-four. I am he who afterwards was found guilty of sins, similar or worse, in other towns of the neighborhood. I am that son of St. Dominic who is known to have repeated the offence at Capua, in 1834 and 1835; and at Naples again, in 1840, in the case of a child of fifteen. I am he who chose the sacristy of the church for one of these crimes and Good Friday for another. Look on me, ye mothers of England, a confessor against Popery, for ye 'ne'er may look upon my like again.'

I am that veritable priest who, after all this, began to speak against, not only the Catholic faith, but the moral law, and perverted others by my teaching. I am the Cavaliere Achilli who then went to Corfu, made the wife of a tailor faithless to her husband, and lived publicly and traveled about with the wife of a chorus-singer. I am that professor in the Protestant College at Malta who, with two others, was dismissed from my post for offences which the authorities can not get themselves to describe. And now attend to me, such as I am, and you shall see what you shall see about the barbarity and profligacy of the Inquisitors of Rome."

Now we have Dr. William's statement, quoted in the early part of this article, contrasted with what Father Newman actually did say in 1850 of the immoral Achilli. Will any really educated person, who knows the exact and true meaning of English words, now agree with Dr. Williams that what Father Newman said concerning Achilli deserves the strictures placed upon it by Dr. Williams that it was "scurrilous"? On the contrary, while vividly depicting the wicked and immoral character of Achilli, Newman showed his exquisite taste and great skill in the use of the English language, by accomplishing his purpose—a hard task in dealing with such a subject—without the use of scurrility; he dealt with a grossly immoral character without using foul or filthy language, a most delicate and difficult feat. Moreover, as Newman afterwards proved the essentials of all his charges, that was the end of Achilli even with those who had taken him up in England. At the trial witnesses from Italy and elsewhere were brought to London, who by appearing as witnesses at the trial had all to lose and nothing to gain, by whom the essential charges made by Newman against Achilli were established. The jury, however, controlled by malice and bigotry and under the influence of a prejudiced judge, in a trial which was a travesty on

justice, as the London *Times* declared, found a verdict against Newman. That verdict, after a rehearing, was denied on technical grounds and resulted in Father Newman being "mulcted," not in a sum equivalent to \$60,000, as Dr. Williams stated before the Committee of Congress and as the *Outlook*, parrot-like, repeated, but in a sum equivalent to \$500.

So that, out of all this, of which Dr. Williams and the *Outlook* would attempt to make so much, when the facts are revealed and the original sources of information unearthed, we have another illustration of the old proverb: "The mountain was in labor and brought forth a ridiculous mouse."

St. Louis, March 22, 1915.

## CATHOLICS AND "BILLY" SUNDAY.

By PATRICK H. CASEY, S.J.

I have been asked: "Why don't Catholics go to hear 'Billy' Sunday?" Here is the reason:

Mr. Sunday is preaching a defective, incomplete Christianity—a Christianity from which are cut away numerous dogmas as dear to us as life itself. Our absence is our protest. A silent protest, no doubt, but none the less emphatic for those who care to notice.

Catholics know full well that the tabernacle service is a Protestant service. It is a religious service. It is conducted by a Protestant. It is held under Protestant auspices. But above all, every doctrine distinctively Catholic is eliminated from the preaching. This is done, not by

any choice or preference of the preacher, but by the very nature of the case, by the demands of the religion he professes and by the very management under which he works.

Now, speaking generally and without going into subtle distinctions which have no bearing on the present question, Catholics are not allowed to take part in a Protestant service, not even a mere "passive" part. Why? Possibly they give no scandal. Possibly their faith is in no way endangered. And the supposition is that they take no "active" part in the service. Their part is that of mere attentive, interested listeners. But this is a part. This is an important part. It is a part that mightily contributes to the success and influence of the whole service. You may contribute to the service by joining in the chorus, by putting a coin in the pan, or by putting yourself under the magic of the speaker. Your attention, your interest, your Catholic attitude of reverence—all contribute to the success of the meeting, therefore, to the success of Protestantism, to the success of a religion which you believe to be false and only a mutilated form of Christianity. This is disloyalty to your own religion.

Take a parable: An acquaintance comes to me and tells me he is going to edit a little book, and he asks me if I will help him. I answer, "Certainly." I ask him what it is. He says it is a nice holiday edition of the Constitution of the United States. I say, "Excellent; let me see the manuscript. Why, what is this? You have here twenty pages, and on nearly every page there is an article or paragraph expunged." "Oh," he answers, "I don't believe in those parts of the Constitution. I have cut them out." "Then away with your book! You'll get no help from me. Why, that's not the Constitution that the fathers signed and their sons handed down to us. Away

# AMERICA

## A Catholic Review of the Week

**E**VERYONE who wishes to form a sound opinion on the great questions of the day; to keep a record of religious progress; and to know the real position of the Church in the thought and activity of modern life should read **AMERICA's** defence of Catholic doctrine built up every week by skilful hands in every region of the globe. Bureaus of information in the leading cities of Europe, Mexico, Central and South America supply prompt and correct information concerning Catholic interests.

Since **AMERICA** was established, from every section of the country have come the most flattering commendations, all voicing the sentiment that Catholics in the United States at last have a general representative organ. This is the time therefore to put an end forever to the taunt that Catholics will not enthusiastically support a worthy Catholic periodical.

*The Editors are the following priests of the Society of Jesus:*

RICHARD H. TIERNEY  
JOSEPH HUSSEIN  
WALTER DWIGHT

J. HARDING FISHER  
M. KENNY  
PAUL L. BLAKELY

Subscription Postpaid:

Four months' trial subscription, \$1.00  
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00  
Canada, \$3.50                      Europe, \$4.00 (16s.)

Judge for yourself—send for a sample copy

Address:

## THE AMERICA PRESS

59 East 83d Street

New York







300.5  
T44

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

wils

300.5 T44

Tierney, Richard Henry, 1870-

Catholic sociology : an address delivered



3 1951 002 001 795 R

Minnesota Library Access Center



9 ZA R02 D04 S15 TB 2